

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action mailed January 11, 2006. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1 - 25 remain pending, claims 10 – 24 having been withdrawn. In particular, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 4. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Election/Restrictions

The Office Action indicates that claim 25 belongs in Group II and thereby remains directed to an invention non-elected with traverse. Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 25 is a dependent claim that depends from and incorporates the limitations of claim 1, which is in Group I. There are no limitations recited in claim 25 that necessitates inclusion in Group II as Group II was described in the First Action. If the basis for the election/restriction requirement is different than that described in that paper, Applicants respectfully request that the specific grounds be identified so that Applicants have an appropriate period of time in which to respond. If, however, the actual grounds are as previously presented, inclusion of claim 25 in Group I appears proper. Clarification is respectfully requested. Notably, however, Applicants respectfully assert that independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Thus, dependent claim 25 should also be in condition for allowance regardless of the particular Group designation.

In the Claims

The Office Action indicates that claim 4 is objected to because of various informalities. As set forth above, Applicants have amended claim 4 and respectfully assert that the objection

has been accommodated.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action indicates that claims 1, 4, 5 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Grimes*. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

In this regard, *Grimes* appears to disclose a structure in which sacrificial conductive material remains between the layers of ferromagnetic material after the structure is formed. This is in direct contrast to the limitations recited in Applicants claims as is set forth in detail below.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite:

1. A method for manufacturing a magnetic inductor core, the method comprising:
depositing layers of ferromagnetic material and at least a first layer of sacrificial conductive material such that a first stack of ferromagnetic layers spaced apart a first predetermined distance is formed and a second stack of ferromagnetic layers spaced apart a second predetermined distance is formed, *the first predetermined distance being established by the sacrificial conductive material located between and separating the layers of ferromagnetic material of the first stack, the second predetermined distance being established by the sacrificial conductive material located between and separating the layers of ferromagnetic material of the second stack*, the first stack being spaced from the second stack;
depositing a support structure such that the support structure is attached to each of the layers of ferromagnetic material of the first stack and to each of the layers of ferromagnetic material of the second stack; and
removing the sacrificial conductive material such that the sacrificial material no longer maintains separation between the layers of ferromagnetic material of the first stack, the first stack and the second stack of ferromagnetic layers being mechanically supported by the support structure such that the support structure maintains separation between the layers of ferromagnetic material of the first stack and between the layers of ferromagnetic material of the second stack.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully assert that *Grimes* is legally deficient for the purpose of anticipating claim 1. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that *Grimes* does not teach or

otherwise disclose at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 1. That is, Grimes is not involved with a structure in which after “removing the sacrificial conductive material”, “the sacrificial material no longer maintains separation between the layers of ferromagnetic material of the first stack,” as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Since claims 4, 5 and 8 are dependent claims that incorporate all the features/limitations of claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims also are in condition for allowance. Additionally, these claims recite other features/limitations that can serve as an independent basis for patentability.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action indicates that claims 2 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Grimes* in view of JP ‘493 and *Croll*. The Office Action also indicates that claims 5 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Grimes*. The Office Action also indicates that claims 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Grimes* in view of JP ‘236. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

In this regard, Applicants respectfully assert that the cited secondary references do not teach or reasonably suggest at least the features indicated above as lacking in *Grimes*. Therefore, since all of the features of Applicants’ claims have not been shown, either expressly or inherently, in one or a combination of references, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and that these dependent claims be placed in condition for allowance.

Cited Art Made of Record

The cited art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



M. Paul Qualey, Reg. No. 43,024

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on 2/24/06.



Signature